Intermediates of Forming Transition Metal Dichalcogenides Heterostructures Revealed by Machine Learning Simulations

Luneng Zhao,¹ Hongsheng Liu,¹ Yuan Chang,¹ Xiaoran Shi,¹ Junfeng Gao,^{1,*} Jijun Zhao,¹ and Feng Ding^{2,†}

¹State Key Laboratory of Structural Analysis, Optimization and CAE Software for Industrial Equipment & School of Physics,

Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, People's Republic of China

²Shenzhen Institute of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shenzhen, China

(Dated: July 9, 2024)

The primary restrictions on 2D transition metal dichalcogenides (TMD) vdW heterostructures (vdWHs) are size limitation and alloying. Recently, a two-step vapor deposition method was reported to grow wafer-scale TMD vdWHs with little contamination [Nature 621, 499 (2023)]. In this letter, we developed a machine learning potential (MLP) which can accurately simulate the growth processes of bilayer MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs under various conditions. Importantly, a SMMS (where M is Mo or W) structure is revealed as a highly stable intermediate easily introduces metal atom exchange and alloying. Eliminating the alloying contamination in TMD vdWHs is avoiding SMMS structure by preventing the landing of bare metal atoms. However, SMMS is revealed as an ideal electrode for MoS_2 FETs with low Schottky barrier.

Two-dimensional (2D) TMDs have attracted intense attention due to their suitable band gap and fast carriers [1-4], high nonlinear optical response [5, 6], ease of layer assembly, etc. vdWHs integrated by pristine TMDs can vastly tune their properties and lead to immense potential applications in microelectronics, optoelectronics, and nonlinear optics [7-14].

However, the controlled growth of TMD vdWHs still faces many challenges. Commonly used mechanical assembly methods can achieve high-quality TMD vdWHs with pristine structures [15, 16], but it is hard to reach wafer-size and is too expensive. Chemical vapor deposition (CVD) has achieved great success in growing wafersize monolayer TMD [12, 17, 18]. Yet, growing TMD vdWHs still faces limitations in wafer size and a tendency to alloy [19]. Among these methods, a feasible approach may be metal-organic chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD) [20].

Recently, a two-step vapor deposition process with a high-to-low temperature strategy was reported to synthesize wafer-size TMD vdWHs [21]. This method first grows a monolayer WS_2 film by depositing a W film on a sapphire substrate and sulfurizing it at 900°C (the highest temperature among the four stacked materials). Next, a Mo film is deposited on the WS_2 monolayer via magnetron sputtering and selenized at 800°C to form MoS_2 . Subsequently, an Nb film is deposited on the WS_2/MoS_2 film via magnetron sputtering and selenized at 700°C to form NbSe₂. Finally, $PtTe_2$ is grown on the $WS_2/MoS_2/NbSe_2$ vdWHs at 350°C (the lowest temperature in the sequence). The final structure is a wafer-size vdWHs (several centimeters) consisting of four layers: $WS_2/MoS_2/NbSe_2/PtTe_2$. The authors propose that during the metal deposition process, the metal atom films float on the TMD surface.

Compared to experimental trials with many parameters and various growth conditions, accurate atomic simulations can certainly provide more insightful understanding of the growth of TMD vdWHs. The growth of TMD vdWHs is always accompanied by rapid formation and breaking, and includes various intermediate motifs with complex chemical bonds, such as metal bonds, covalent bonds, both covalent and ionic characters of Mo-S bonds, and layered vdW forces. Density functional theory (DFT) can describe the complex chemical bonding but cannot afford large-scale simulations. In contrast, classical molecular dynamics (MD) can simulate large systems but cannot handle complex chemical bond recombination. Although various MLP have been developed and reported to simulate large systems with accuracy comparable to DFT [22–27], very few MLPs can actually handle such complex growth processes of TMD vdWHs.

In this letter, an MLP was developed by training on vast DFT data and a revised Equivariant Graph Neural Network (EGNN) implemented in the NequIP package [22]. The MLP was then implemented into molecular dynamics (MLPMD), enabling both large-scale and accurate simulation of the growth process of MoS_2/WS_2 vd-WHs. Our results indicate that a bare metal atomic layer is unstable on TMD layers; it will spontaneously sink into the S laver and form a crucial intermediate structure (SMMS) with high stability. This facilitates the exchange between Mo and W atoms, revealing the atomic formation mechanism of TMD alloys. To grow pristine TMD vdWHs, avoiding the SMMS structure is key, which can be achieved by preventing bare metal atom adsorption on existing TMD. On the other hand, the SMMS structure serves as an ideal metallic electrode with a low Schottky barrier, enabling MoS₂ integrated circuits through planar deposition of metal atoms on uncovered MoS_2 .

As discussed above, we have to cover an extensive range of Mo, W, S, and their hybrid structures to increase the complexity of the MLP models. It is also necessary to design and select training data with great care, and to apply balanced weighting to different structural



FIG. 1: Illustration of the key components of our developed MLP and its accuracy. (a) The comprehensive and vast datasets utilized for training, visualized using a structural landscape enhanced by principal component analysis (PCA), highlighting the diversity of TMD, MoS₂/WS₂ vdWHs, and various complex structures. (b-c) Detailed comparison of the correlation energies (b) and atomic forces (c) of the MLP's performance with the DFT benchmarks.

configurations, including their elemental bulks, different layers of TMDs, MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs, and their interactions with both homo- and hetero-metallic clusters, with S clusters, and various configurations of MoWS alloys [see Fig. 1(a)]. These DFT calculations collectively constitute a comprehensive dataset of approximately 26,000 entries. With these vast data and careful training, Fig. 1(b) exhibits excellent agreement between the MLP and DFT energies, with a mean absolute error (MAE) of 5.0 meV and a root mean square error (RMSE) of 10.6 meV per atom. Fig. 1(c) also shows that the atomic forces predicted by the MLP closely reproduce those from DFT, with an MAE of 74.3 meV/Å and an RMSE of 151.1 meV/Å.

To further verify the capability of our MLP in simulating the growth of TMD materials through MLPMD, we randomly mixed Mo, W, and S atoms in a 1:1:4 ratio, then annealed the mixture at temperatures ranging from 1500 K to 900 K for 2 ns. Ordered TMD layers, including the 1H and 1T phases, were formed, demonstrating the reliability of our MLP in simulating the complex layered growth behavior of TMDs [Fig. S1 [28]]. An animation of the annealing process can be found in the supplementary materials, specifically in video S1 [28].

Before investigating TMD vdWHs, the developed MLPMD model successfully simulated the growth of bilayer MoS_2 through a two-step vapor deposition method [21]. First, the adsorbed Mo atom was unstable on the MoS_2 layer [see Fig. 2(a)] and quickly sank beneath the S atom layer within tens of picoseconds [see Fig. 2(b)], releasing 1.45 eV of energy. In previous extensive studies, single or paired metal atoms suspended on bare surfaces exhibited significant catalytic enhance-



FIG. 2: (a-c) Structures and corresponding energy profiles for Mo atom deposition (a) and embedding (b) into the MoS_2 layer. (d-e) Snapshots of MLPMD simulations at 900 K for 0.25 monolayer (ML) (d) and (e) 1.0 ML Mo atom deposition on an existing MoS_2 layer. (f-i) Four possible structures: MoSMoS (f), SMoMoS intermediate (g), SMoMoMoS (h), and SMoMoMoMoS with more Mo atoms embedded (i). (j-k) Phonon dispersion relations for MoSMoS (j) and SMoMoS (k). (l) Formation energy convex hull of the considered MoS structures.

ment [29–32]. This indicates that the configuration of metal atoms needs to be carefully considered in singleatom catalysis.

Subsequently, individual Mo atoms were simulated to be continuously sputtered onto the existing MoS_2 layer with a kinetic energy of 0.12 eV, which is significantly lower than the energy of standard magnetron sputtering. At 900K, the deposition process of Mo atoms forming 0.25 monolayers (ML) [see Fig. 2(d)] and 1.0 ML [see Fig. 2(e)] demonstrated the behavior of Mo atoms on the MoS_2 layer. Throughout the MLPMD simulation, no Mo atoms formed the MoSMoS structure [see Fig. 2(f)], instead, all deposited Mo atoms spontaneously sank into the MoS_2 layer, tending to form the intriguing SMoMoS structure, as shown in Fig. 2(g). We further compared these two structures in detail in terms of energy and dynamic stability. From MoSMoS to SMoMoS, the energy significantly decreased by 1.73 eV per Mo atom, indicating a strong driving force towards the formation of the SMoMoS structure. Additionally, the phonon dispersion of MoSMoS simulated by DFT exhibited significant imaginary frequencies [see Fig. 2(j)], revealing the instability of MoSMoS. In contrast, the phonon dispersion of the SMoMoS structure showed no imaginary frequencies [see Fig. 2(k)], further confirming that MoSMoS would spontaneously transform into SMoMoS. It is worth noting that the phonon dispersion simulated by the MLP accurately reproduced the DFT results, validating the accuracy of our MLP in terms of atomic forces.

In addition to the SMoMoS structure formed by de-

positing 1 ML of Mo atoms, further structures such as SMoMoMoS [SMo₃S in Fig. 2(h)] and SMoMoMoMoS [SMo₄S in Fig. 2(i)] can be formed by increasing the number of Mo atoms. The convex hull of MoS compounds was plotted by varying the Mo ratio, referencing the bulk phases of elements Mo and S, as shown in Fig. 2(l). Clearly, MoS₂ has the lowest energy, while SMoMoS is 214 meV/atom above the convex hull. SMo₃S and SMo₄S are 253 meV/atom above the convex hull, higher than SMoMoS, indicating that when approximately 1 ML of Mo atoms is deposited on the MoS₂ surface, SMoMoS is the most likely intermediate. Long-term MLPMD simulations further validated the stability of SMoMoS, as shown in Fig. S2(a) [28].

Referring to the two-step evaporation deposition process [21], MLPMD simulations were used to continuously deposit Mo atoms on a WS₂ monolayer to form MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs [see Supplementary Material Video S3 [28]]. The continuous snapshots of the simulation are shown in Fig. 3(a)-3(c), taken at approximately 60 ps, 151 ps, and 1.1 ns, respectively. Similarly, Mo atoms do not remain on the WS₂ but spontaneously sink into the WS₂ monolayer. Most importantly, during the simulation, Mo and W atoms in the SMoWS intermediate structure of different layers can exchange [Fig. 3(d)-3(f)], leading to alloying. This sinking and subsequent alloying



FIG. 3: (a)-(c) Snapshots of the growth structure of MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs during the two-step evaporation deposition process (Mo atoms deposited on WS₂). (d)-(f) Exchange of Mo and W atoms observed during the MLPMD simulation process. (g) Schematic of the Mo layer on the WS₂ surface and (j) simulated STEM image. (h) Schematic of the non-alloyed SMoWS intermediate structure and (k) simulated STEM image. (i) Schematic of the alloyed SMMS structure and (l) simulated STEM image. (m) Relative free energy of SMMS structures with different alloy compositions at 300 K.

transformation can be deeply understood by comparing the relevant energies and phonon dispersions.

A monolayer of Mo on top of a WS_2 monolayer [Fig. 3(g)] is neither energetically favorable nor dynamically stable evident from significant imaginary frequencies in the phonon dispersion, see Fig. S3(a)]. Instead, it completely sinks in and embeds beneath the top S layer of the WS₂ monolayer, forming the SMoWS intermediate structure [Fig. 3(h)], releasing 2.08 eV of energy per Mo atom. In addition to the sinking of Mo atoms, atomic exchange between Mo and W atoms occurs, transforming the SMoWS intermediate structure into an alloyed SMMS structure [Fig. 3(i)]. The phonon spectra of both SMoWS [Fig. S3(b)] and SMMS [Fig. S3(c)] show no imaginary frequencies throughout the Brillouin zone [28], confirming their dynamic stability. Long-term MLPMD further validates the stability of the SMMS structure, as shown in Figs. S2(b) and S2(c) [28].

To identify the energetic driving force for alloying, we calculated the relative energy change ΔF for different distributions of metal atoms in the upper and lower layers. Here, ΔF is defined as $\Delta F = (E - E_{\rm SMoWS} - TS)/N$, where $E_{\rm SMoWS}$ denotes the energy of the non-alloyed SMMS structure [Fig. 3(h)]. The configurational en-x) $\ln(1-x)$, where k is the Boltzmann constant and x is the proportion of one type of metal atom in the upper metal layer. By randomly exchanging the metal atoms in the upper and lower layers within a (7×7) supercell of the SMMS structure and optimizing the structure, we obtained ΔF for SMMS structures with different alloying ratios [Fig. 3(m)]. We found that the free energy is minimized when different metal atoms are uniformly distributed in the upper and lower layers, i.e., the energy of $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ [Fig. 3(i)] is approximately 10.8 meV/atom lower than that of the non-alloyed SMoWS structure. This energy reduction is primarily attributed to configurational entropy, and the alloyed structure also eliminates stress caused by asymmetry.

Furthermore, the lattice constant of the relaxed SMMS structure is approximately 5% smaller than that of monolayer WS₂. Therefore, when a sufficient number of Mo atoms are deposited and embedded into the WS₂ substrate, the accumulated stress leads to cracks in the bottom metal-S layer, accelerating the exchange of Mo and W atoms. The STEM images simulated by abTEM [Figs. 3(j)-3(1)] show distinct differences between the initial (MoSWS), SMoWS structure, and the alloyed $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ intermediates. These images may assist in experimentally identifying key evidence of atomic rearrangement and alloying of Mo deposited on WS₂. This warrants careful experimental investigation but is beyond our current capabilities.

We now pose the question of what happens when S is deposited on the SMoMoS and $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ intermediate phases during



FIG. 4: (a-e) MLPMD simulations of the growth of alloyed $Mo_x W_{1-x}S_2/Mo_{1-x}W_xS_2$ vdWHs by depositing S atoms on the alloyed SMMS intermediate phase. (f-o) MLPMD simulations of various Mo clusters on MoS₂: (f-i) deposition of single Mo atoms; (j) trajectories of Mo atoms in the xy plane; (k-n) deposition of Mo-S clusters and (o) trajectories of Mo atoms in the xyplane.

the second step. For SMoMoS, a sufficient amount of S atoms was further deposited on the top surface of the SMoMoS intermediate phase [Figures S4(a)-S4(e) and Supplementary Video S4 [28]]. Interestingly, the SMoMoS intermediate phase was very stable initially. After 531 ps [Fig. S4(b) [28]], we observed that S atoms penetrated the SMoMoS structure and pulled some Mo atoms to the surface, gradually forming a bilayer of MoS₂ [Fig. S4(e) [28]].

Similarly, for the alloyed $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ intermediate phase, a sufficient amount of S atoms was further deposited on the top surface [Supplementary Video S5 [28]]. As shown in Fig. 4(a), the alloyed $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ intermediate phase was also very stable initially. After 608 ps of simulation, S atoms penetrated the $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ structure and pulled metal atoms from the top surface [Fig. 4(b)]. However, in the alloyed intermediate phase, S atoms did not selectively pull either Mo or W atoms but pulled both Mo and W atoms from the upper layer to the surface [Figs. 4(c)-4(e)]. Therefore, the resulting structure was not a distinct MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs but rather an alloyed $Mo_xW_{1-x}S_2/Mo_{1-x}W_xS_2$ vdWHs.

To achieve high-quality, non-alloyed TMD vdWHs, it is crucial to prevent Mo atom sinking and the formation of SMMS intermediate phases during growth. We employed MLPMD to study the behavior of single Mo atoms and various Mo-S clusters on a MoS₂ substrate. A bare Mo atom can quickly sink into the MoS₂ monolayer, and once submerged, the Mo atom remains firmly embedded with no surface diffusion observed throughout the simulation [Fig. 4(f)-4(i)]. The trajectory projection in the xy plane [Fig. 4(e)] further confirms this, showing that the Mo atom is trapped at its initial position throughout the 1.4 ns simulation. In contrast, once a Mo atom bonds with an S atom, the $Mo-S_1$ structure always floats on the surface without sinking [Fig. 4(k)-4(n)]. Mo- S_1 exhibits slightly higher surface diffusion (moving one step every 200 ps), primarily between adjacent Mo top sites [Fig. 4(0)]. Notably, as the amount of S in the structure increases (Mo- S_2 and Mo- S_3), the surface mobility progressively enhances without embedding [Fig. S5 [28]]. This finding suggests that providing an excess of S is crucial for preventing the sinking of bare metal atoms and subsequent exchange. Moreover, these sulfur-rich structures exhibit faster surface diffusion, which is advantageous for the nucleation and aggregation of TMD layers.

By co-depositing Mo and S atoms to form MoS clusters, the homogeneous epitaxy and heteroepitaxy of the second layer of MoS_2 on MoS_2 and WS_2 were simulated at 1100 K, respectively. These simulations are analogous to the MOCVD growth of MoS_2 (see Supplementary Materials Video S6 and Video S7 [28]). As shown in Fig. S6(a) [28], the simulation starts by placing a triangular 1H-MoS₂ nucleus on the surface of the monolayer 1H- MoS_2 , representing the nucleation at the onset of growth. Mo and S atoms are deposited onto the surface at a specific rate of 516 ps per layer. Figures S6(b)-S6(d) [28] display the system from 106 ps to 400 ps, highlighting the ongoing growth process. After 5 ns of simulation, the growth of the second layer of MoS_2 on the monolayer MoS_2 is essentially complete. From 106-400 ps, the MoS_2 layer exhibits characteristics of the 1H phase, as shown in Fig. S6(e) [28]. The 1T phase present in the early stages mostly disappears, indicating that MoS_2 transitions from the 1T phase to the more stable 1H phase as growth proceeds. Notably, many defects observed during the phase transition are repaired. The simulation of growing the second layer of MoS_2 on a monolayer WS_2 proceeds similarly, as shown in Figs. S6(f)-S6(j) [28], producing a growth pattern characteristic of the 1T phase [Figs. S6(g)-S6(i) [28]]. As the simulation progresses further, the 1H phase of MoS_2 eventually forms on the WS_2 substrate, as shown in Fig. S6(j) [28].

As mentioned above, the SMMS intermediate structure hinders the growth of different MoS_2/WS_2 vdWHs. However, the SMMS structure is also a new 2D structure. As shown by the electronic band structures, both SMoMoS and $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ are metallic [Fig. S7(a) and Fig. S7(b) [28]]. Thus, they have potential applications as metallic electrodes for TMDs. For example, we can first cover MoS_2 with a protective material and then sputter Mo atoms/clusters in the uncovered regions [33, 34]. This method enables the creation of spatially resolved integrated circuits within a single MoS_2



FIG. 5: (a) MoS₂-SMoMoS contact structure and LDOS. (b) Schematic of p-type SBH at the MoS₂-SMoMoS interface. (c)

 MoS_2 -S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S contact structure and LDOS. (d) Schematic of p-type SBH at the MoS_2 -S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S interface.

sheet.

We calculated the local density of states (LDOS) of various SMMS configurations at the metalsemiconductor interface [35]. By analyzing the difference between the valence band maximum of MoS_2 in the LDOS and the Fermi energy, we determined the p-type Schottky barrier height (SBH) [Fig. 5]. Our calculations indicate that the p-type SBH for the MoS_2 -SMoMoS configuration is 0.39 eV. For the $S(Mo_{0.5}W_{0.5})(W_{0.5}Mo_{0.5})S$ configuration, the p-type SBH is 0.45 eV.

In summary, we developed an MLP for simulating the stacking growth of TMDs. This potential function accurately characterizes the complex processes of TMD stacking growth. It also details the recently developed twostep vapor deposition method. In this process, we identified a potential intermediate state that may pave the way for novel electrode designs in TMD-based devices. Our study introduces a new theoretical framework for understanding TMD stacking growth.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12374253, 12074053). The authors also acknowledge computing support from DUT Supercomputing Center, Shanghai Supercomputer Center, and Sugon Supercomputer Center.

* jfgao@dlut.edu.cn

- H. K. Ng, D. Xiang, A. Suwardi, G. Hu, K. Yang, Y. Zhao, T. Liu, Z. Cao, H. Liu, S. Li, J. Cao, Q. Zhu, Z. Dong, C. K. I. Tan, D. Chi, C.-W. Qiu, K. Hippalgaonkar, G. Eda, M. Yang, and J. Wu, Nature Electronics 5, 489 (2022).
- [2] W. Jin, P.-C. Yeh, N. Zaki, D. Zhang, J. T. Sadowski, A. Al-Mahboob, A. M. Van Der Zande, D. A. Chenet, J. I. Dadap, I. P. Herman, P. Sutter, J. Hone, and R. M. Osgood, Physical Review Letters 111, 106801 (2013).
- [3] D. Y. Qiu, F. H. Da Jornada, and S. G. Louie, Physical Review Letters 111, 216805 (2013).
- [4] K. F. Mak, C. Lee, J. Hone, J. Shan, and T. F. Heinz, Physical Review Letters 105, 136805 (2010).
- [5] X. Xu, C. Trovatello, F. Mooshammer, Y. Shao, S. Zhang, K. Yao, D. N. Basov, G. Cerullo, and P. J. Schuck, Nature Photonics 16, 698 (2022).
- [6] X. Yin, Z. Ye, D. A. Chenet, Y. Ye, K. O'Brien, J. C. Hone, and X. Zhang, Science 344, 488 (2014).
- [7] C. Jin, J. Kim, M. I. B. Utama, E. C. Regan, H. Kleemann, H. Cai, Y. Shen, M. J. Shinner, A. Sengupta, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, S. Tongay, A. Zettl, and F. Wang, Science 360, 893 (2018).
- [8] E. Lorchat, M. Selig, F. Katsch, K. Yumigeta, S. Tongay, A. Knorr, C. Schneider, and S. Höfling, Physical Review Letters 126, 037401 (2021).
- [9] R. Pisoni, T. Davatz, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, T. Ihn, and K. Ensslin, Physical Review Letters 123, 117702 (2019).
- [10] M. H. Naik and M. Jain, Physical Review Letters 121, 266401 (2018).
- [11] J. Liu, Nature Materials 19, 824 (2020).
- [12] L. Liu, T. Li, L. Ma, W. Li, S. Gao, W. Sun, R. Dong, X. Zou, D. Fan, L. Shao, C. Gu, N. Dai, Z. Yu, X. Chen, X. Tu, Y. Nie, P. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Shi, and X. Wang, Nature **605**, 69 (2022).
- [13] C. Jiang, A. Rasmita, H. Ma, Q. Tan, Z. Zhang, Z. Huang, S. Lai, N. Wang, S. Liu, X. Liu, T. Yu, Q. Xiong, and W.-b. Gao, Nature Electronics 5, 23 (2022).
- [14] M. H. Naik, E. C. Regan, Z. Zhang, Y.-H. Chan, Z. Li, D. Wang, Y. Yoon, C. S. Ong, W. Zhao, S. Zhao, M. I. B. Utama, B. Gao, X. Wei, M. Sayyad, K. Yumigeta, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, S. Tongay, F. H. da Jornada, F. Wang, and S. G. Louie, Nature 609, 52 (2022).
- [15] K. Kang, K.-H. Lee, Y. Han, H. Gao, S. Xie, D. A. Muller, and J. Park, Nature 550, 229 (2017).
- [16] W. Wang, N. Clark, M. Hamer, A. Carl, E. Tovari, S. Sullivan-Allsop, E. Tillotson, Y. Gao, H. de Latour, F. Selles, J. Howarth, E. G. Castanon, M. Zhou, H. Bai, X. Li, A. Weston, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, C. Mattevi, T. H. Bointon, P. V. Wiper, A. J. Strudwick, L. A. Ponomarenko, A. V. Kretinin, S. J. Haigh, A. Summerfield, and R. Gorbachev, Nature Electronics 6, 981 (2023).
- [17] X. Zhang, T. H. Choudhury, M. Chubarov, Y. Xiang, B. Jariwala, F. Zhang, N. Alem, G.-C. Wang, J. A. Robinson, and J. M. Redwing, Nano Letters 18, 1049 (2018).
- [18] K. Kang, S. Xie, L. Huang, Y. Han, P. Y. Huang, K. F. Mak, C.-J. Kim, D. Muller, and J. Park, Nature 520, 656 (2015).
- [19] X. Li, J. Yang, H. Sun, L. Huang, H. Li, and J. Shi, Advanced Materials, 2305115 (2023).

[†] gniding@gmail.com

- [20] D. Xiang and T. Liu, Nature Electronics 4, 868 (2021).
- [21] Z. Zhou, F. Hou, X. Huang, G. Wang, Z. Fu, W. Liu, G. Yuan, X. Xi, J. Xu, J. Lin, and L. Gao, Nature 621, 499 (2023).
- [22] S. Batzner, A. Musaelian, L. Sun, M. Geiger, J. P. Mailoa, M. Kornbluth, N. Molinari, T. E. Smidt, and B. Kozinsky, Nature Communications 13, 2453 (2022).
- [23] P. A. Santos-Florez, H. Yanxon, B. Kang, Y. Yao, and Q. Zhu, Physical Review Letters 129, 185701 (2022).
- [24] J. Daru, H. Forbert, J. Behler, and D. Marx, Physical Review Letters 129, 226001 (2022).
- [25] L. Hu, B. Huang, and F. Liu, Physical Review Letters 126, 176101 (2021).
- [26] T. Xie and J. C. Grossman, Physical Review Letters 120, 145301 (2018).
- [27] P. Li and F. Ding, Science Advances 8, eabq2900 (2022).
- [28] See Supplemental Material at https://journals.aps. org/prl/, which includes Refs.[22, 36-42], for details on the machine learning potential and supplemental figures of the SMMS stability, band structure, and growth process simulation.
- [29] K. Qi, X. Cui, L. Gu, S. Yu, X. Fan, M. Luo, S. Xu, N. Li, L. Zheng, Q. Zhang, J. Ma, Y. Gong, F. Lv, K. Wang, H. Huang, W. Zhang, S. Guo, W. Zheng, and P. Liu, Nature Communications 10, 5231 (2019).
- [30] Y. Zhang, D. Wang, G. Wei, B. Li, Z. Mao, S.-M. Xu, S. Tang, J. Jiang, Z. Li, X. Wang, and X. Xu, JACS Au 4, 1509 (2024).
- [31] Q. Dang, S. Tang, T. Liu, X. Li, X. Wang, W. Zhong,

Y. Luo, and J. Jiang, The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters 12, 8355 (2021).

- [32] L. Liu and A. Corma, Chemical Reviews 118, 4981 (2018).
- [33] Y. Y. Illarionov, A. G. Banshchikov, D. K. Polyushkin, S. Wachter, T. Knobloch, M. Thesberg, L. Mennel, M. Paur, M. Stöger-Pollach, A. Steiger-Thirsfeld, M. I. Vexler, M. Waltl, N. S. Sokolov, T. Mueller, and T. Grasser, Nature Electronics 2, 230 (2019).
- [34] Z. Xiao, J. Song, D. K. Ferry, S. Ducharme, and X. Hong, Physical Review Letters 118, 236801 (2017).
- [35] U. Landman, R. N. Barnett, A. G. Scherbakov, and P. Avouris, Physical Review Letters 85, 1958 (2000).
- [36] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Physical Review B 54, 11169 (1996).
- [37] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Physical Review B 59, 1758 (1999).
- [38] J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang, Physical Review B 45, 13244 (1992).
- [39] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Physical Review Letters 77, 3865 (1996).
- [40] A. P. Thompson, H. M. Aktulga, R. Berger, D. S. Bolintineanu, W. M. Brown, P. S. Crozier, P. J. in 't Veld, A. Kohlmeyer, S. G. Moore, T. D. Nguyen, R. Shan, M. J. Stevens, J. Tranchida, C. Trott, and S. J. Plimpton, Computer Physics Communications 271, 108171 (2022).
- [41] S. Nosé, The Journal of Chemical Physics 81, 511 (1984).
- [42] W. G. Hoover, Physical Review A **31**, 1695 (1985).